

**Remarks**

Applicants have reviewed this Application in light of the Office Action mailed 26 February 2007. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**The Patent and Trademark Office Received Item M  
from the IDS Submitted 13 November 2006**

The Examiner states, "It is noted that item M on the IDS received on 13 November 2006 (Davidson, Attorney Document Number 064747.1049) was not received by the Examiner and was not considered." Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent and Trademark Office in fact received Item M. However, the Patent and Trademark Office scanned Items L and M from the 13 November 2006 IDS as a single document, instead of two separate documents, as Applicants submitted them. According to the Image File Wrapper in Private PAIR, Item M appears along with Item L in the entry identified as follows:

|                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Mail Room Date:       | 13 November 2006 |
| Document Description: | NPL Documents    |
| Document Category:    | Prior Art        |
| Page Count:           | 245              |

Item L appears at Pages 1-122 of the combined document and Item M appears at Pages 123-244 of the combined document. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider Item M from the 13 November 2006 IDS.

**Dependent Claims 6, 14, and 26 are Definite**

The Examiner rejects dependent Claims 6, 14 and, 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 para. 2 as being indefinite. To expedite issuance of a patent from this Application, Applicants have amended dependent Claims 6, 14, and 26. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent Claim 6, 14, and 26.

**Independent Claims 1, 9, and, 21 are Allowable Over *Karpoff***

The Examiner rejects independent Claims 1, 9, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0049740 by Karpoff ("*Karpoff*"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

*Karpoff* merely discloses an InfiniBand server architecture that includes one or more central processing units (CPUs) inside a server boundary connected to a switch outside the server boundary. (Figure 4A; Paragraphs 0085 and 0089). The switch includes one or more controller devices. (Figure 10; Paragraph 104).

In contrast, independent Claim 1 of this Application recites:

A node comprising:  
a motherboard;  
a switch comprising eight or more ports, the switch integrated on the motherboard; and  
at least two processors, each processor communicably coupled to the integrated switch and integrated on the motherboard.

Independent Claims 9 and 21 recite limitations that are substantially similar to limitations of independent Claim 1.

*Karpoff* fails to disclose, teach, suggest each and every limitation of independent Claim 1. As an example, even assuming for the sake of argument that the CPUs in *Karpoff* could be properly considered ***at least two processors, each processor integrated on the motherboard***, as independent Claim 1 recites, *Karpoff* would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest ***a switch comprising eight or more ports, the switch integrated on the motherboard***, as independent Claim 1 recites. Instead, in *Karpoff*, the CPUs and the switch reside on opposite sides of a server boundary, which clearly teaches away from the CPUs and the switch in *Karpoff* being ***integrated on the same motherboard***, as independent Claim 1 recites. As another example, even assuming for the sake of argument that one device in *Karpoff* contained both a switch and a controller device (as the Examiner asserts) and that the switch and the controller device could be properly considered ***a switch comprising eight or***

*more ports* and *at least two processors*, respectively, *Karpoff* would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that the one device is a *motherboard* and that both the switch and the controller device were *integrated on the one motherboard*, as independent Claim 1 recites. *Karpoff* provides no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion whatsoever that the switch and the multiple controller devices are *integrated on one motherboard*, as independent Claim 1 recites.

“To anticipate, every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim.” *Brown v. 3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2001). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. ch. 2131 (Rev. 3, Aug. 2005) (quoting *Verdegaal*, 814 F.2d at 631). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); M.P.E.P. ch. 2131 (Rev. 3, Aug. 2005) (quoting *Richardson*, 868 F.2d at 1236). Furthermore, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” M.P.E.P. ch. 2131 (Rev. 3, Aug. 2005) (citing *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). As shown above, *Karpoff* fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation recited in independent Claim 1. Therefore, *Karpoff* does not anticipate independent Claim 1 under governing Federal Circuit case law and the M.P.E.P.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 9, and 21 and all their dependent claims.

**Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application, the Examiner may call Travis W. Thomas, Attorney for Applicants, at 214.953.6676.

The Commissioner may charge any fee and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'T. T.' with a long horizontal stroke extending from the second 'T'.

Travis W. Thomas  
Reg. No. 48,667

**Date:** 29 May 2007

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer Number      **45507**